

2003-04
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
ANNUAL REPORT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For their contributions to 2003-2004 Program Review

Dr. Michael Harris, Associate Provost
Dr. Robert Holkeboer, Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research
Brian Anderson, Director, Office of Research Development
The Graduate Council
Dr. Paul Schollaert, former Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Sally McCracken, former President, Faculty Council
Dr. Daryl Barton, President, Faculty Council
The Faculty Council
Mark Byrd, Executive Director, Institutional Research and Information Management
Office of Institutional Research and Information Management
Office of Records and Registration
Dr. Donald Bennion, Director, Academic Assessment
Dr. William Miller, Director, Course and Program Development
Brian Hoxie, Director, Academic Programming
Lynn Tilton, former Director, Course and Catalog Maintenance
Donelle Goerlitz, Academic Programs Analyst
Danielle Amtmann, Graduate Assistant, Academic Programming
Sheri Bolick, Secretary, Academic Programming
Susan Campbell, Administrative Secretary, Associate Provost

and to the many others across campus who helped ensure the success of
2003-04 Program Review.

PREFACE

The *2003-2004 Program Review Annual Report* provides an update on the current status of the restructured program review process at EMU. After a period of several years (1996-2000) without program review, the process was revised and began again in spring 2001.

The principle reason for program review is to enhance academic quality. Additionally, the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), in their 2001 accreditation site visit, was particularly interested in program related assessment activities, which are enhanced by program review.

We assume that every program can be improved and that it is the responsibility of faculty, programs, departments, and administration to collaborate toward that goal.

The *2003-2004 Program Review Annual Report* begins with a brief description of Program Review at EMU. The report reviews the findings of the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 process; presents the results for 2003-2004; shapes the 2004-2005 Program Review rotation; describes the follow-up activities and timelines; and details future plans.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the staff of Academic Programming for their dedication, leadership and hard work for the advancement of the Program Review process, especially Brian Hoxie, Director, Academic Programming and Donelle Goerlitz, Academic Programs Analyst, the key person in the process.

In addition, I want to thank the faculty, staff, and administrators who work diligently and put in long hours to ensure the success of Program Review.

Ellene Tratras Contis
Associate Vice President for Academic Administrative Services
August 2004

2003-2004
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
ANNUAL REPORT

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
AUGUST 2004

2003-2004 PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTIONS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	6
II. 2001-2002 PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS	7
III. 2002-2003 PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS	8
IV. 2003-2004 PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS	8
V. 2003-2004 PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS	12
•	
VI. 2004-2005 PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS	13
•	
VII. FOLLOW-UP IN PROGRESS	18
VIII. OUTLOOK	20
 <u>APPENDICES</u>	
A.....	22
B.....	25
C.....	27
D.....	30
E.....	33
F.....	35
G.....	38

2003-2004 Program Review Annual Report

I. INTRODUCTION

In preparation for the 2001 NCA visit, reinstatement of Program Review at Eastern Michigan University became a priority. The process was restructured and a draft Program Review Departmental Manual was developed. The manual was unanimously approved by Faculty Council in spring 2001. A ten-year rotation was established (*Appendix A*) that includes two cycles of program review for each department and culminates with a two-year period dedicated to the NCA accreditation preparation and on-site visit. It is unclear at this time whether or not the university's participation in the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) will impact the ten-year rotation.

The purpose of this report is to review the findings of the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 Program Review process; outline the 2003-2004 process; present the results of 2003-2004, including challenges faced; shape 2004-2005 Program Review; describe the follow-up activities and timelines; and explain plans for 2004-2005 and beyond. The report will highlight the successes, discuss the adjustments made along the way to streamline and enhance the process, describe the follow-up actions and their current status, and outline strategies to enhance the Program Review process in the future.

Overview of the Program Review process

The Program Review process is divided into the following phases, which transpire over the course of one and a half academic years:

- Establishment of the annual timeline (*Appendix B*).
- Program definition.
- Department workshops.
- Data analysis and distribution.
- Report compilation.
- Campus feedback on reports.
- Roundtable Discussions.
- Provost's program assessments.
- Follow-up actions (these activities are continuous in nature and carry on well past the first year and a half).

As the Program Review process unfolds each year, all documents are made available on the Academic Affairs web site at the following URL: <http://www.emich.edu/public/aa/pr/>.

Assessment ratings

Each year, after conducting a detailed review of the roundtable proceedings, the program review reports, the dean's comments, peer review comments from across campus, and other program related information, every program receives an assessment rating from the Provost that includes follow up actions and deadlines. The table below lists the assessment rating categories and summarizes required follow up actions, as well as the level of interaction necessary from various levels of leadership within the division, including the Provost, college deans, and department heads. There are also different time constraints listed for completing follow-up activities.

ASSESSMENT RATINGS	
(1) Continuation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific requirements. • Continue normal continuous improvement activities already in place.
(2) Continuation with specific changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write, have approved, and implement a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan. • Plan directed by the department head, who will report quarterly, in writing, to the college dean. • The college dean will report on progress to the Provost.
(3) Probation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write, have approved and implement a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan. • Must include a timeline, <u>not to exceed three years</u>, for implementation of the improvements. • The college dean must report quarterly, in writing, to the Provost on progress made. • Perform an abbreviated program review annually until all noted deficiencies are corrected.
(4) Phase Out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have 30 days to respond to the rating, in writing, to the Provost. • If the decision is upheld, the department is required to develop a phase out plan, to be submitted to the Provost within 30 days. • If phase out is implemented, faculty will be reassigned, retrained, or terminated based on stipulations in the Eastern Michigan University AAUP contract. • Once a plan is adopted, the college dean will report to the Provost, in writing, on progress made on the Phase Out action.

II. 2001-2002 PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS

Provost's program assessments

The culmination to the 2001-2002 Program Review process included the recommendations from the Associate Provost and the assessment rating decisions (summarized in the table above) issued by the Provost. The decisions were based on the review and analysis of the reports, outside comments, open discussions, and recommendations provided by the College Deans.

2001-2002 summary of program assessment ratings

A "by program" listing of the ratings, including specific follow up actions and due dates, can be found in *Appendix C*. Section VII of the report will discuss the status of follow up actions in detail. The table below summarizes the results of the Provost's assessment ratings.

2001-2002 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATINGS	
<i>RATING</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
(1) Continuation	23
(2) Continuation with specific changes	30
(3) Probation	2
(4) Phase Out	0
TOTALS	55

Detail in Appendix C

III. 2002-2003 PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS

Provost's program assessments

The culmination of the 2002-2003 Program Review process was the ratings decisions that were issued by the Provost. The decisions were based on the review and analysis of the reports, outside comments, open discussions, and recommendations provided by the college deans and the Associate Provost. The rating levels are described in Section I of this report.

2002-2003 summary of program assessment ratings

The table below summarizes the results of the Provost’s assessment ratings for the 2002-2003 rotation of Program Review. A “by program” listing of the ratings, including specific follow up actions and due dates, can be found in *Appendix D*. Section VII of the report will discuss the status of follow up actions in detail.

2002-2003 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATINGS	
<i>RATINGS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
(1) Continuation	34
(2) Continuation with specific changes	22
(3) Probation	10
(4) Phase Out	5
TOTALS	71

Detail in Appendix E.

IV. 2003-2004 PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

While several adjustments were made to the Program Review process after the first two rotations, 2003-2004 Program Review improvements were made in the areas of time, funding and data to continue to refine the process. Additionally, the Academic Programming staff updated the Program Review Department Manual, improved the workshop presentation, and prepared updated materials for Roundtable Discussions. Additionally, during fall 2003, winter 2004, and spring 2004 terms, the Associate Provost and the Office of Academic Programming met extensively with the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management to discuss and define data required for 2004-2005 Program Review.

Process overview

Program Review 2003-2004 was initiated in fall, 2002 with establishment of an annual timeline (*Appendix E*). Next, the Office of Academic Programming determined a tentative list of ISIS program codes in each department. Scheduled departments were contacted in winter, 2003 by the Office of Academic Programming to schedule workshops to be held during the winter, 2003 term.

Due to the complicated nature of ISIS data extraction, determination of what data would be provided was based on discussions between Academic Programming staff and that of the Office of Records and Registration, regarding ISIS data accessibility. Data requests were forwarded to the Office of Records and Registration during fall, 2002 and with the last files received in winter, 2003. The intent was to allow the Office of Records and Registration enough time to accommodate our data needs, while at the same time working on the Banner implementation requirements. At the same time, discussions began with the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management regarding definition of a uniform Program Review dataset for departments to use during the 2004-2005 rotation.

Academic Programming conducted individual department workshops during February and March 2003. The Human, Environmental, and Consumer Resources department, aware of impending administrative changes related to the reorganization of the College of Technology and

the College of Health and Human Services, requested a postponement of their Program Review. Their request was granted, and they were moved to the 2004-2005 rotation, under the direction of the College of Health and Human Services dean's office and in collaboration with the College of Technology dean's office.

Roundtable Discussions were scheduled in fall 2003 to give departments as well as administration, early notice for their March – June, 2004 meeting dates. Program Review reports were due to College Deans in early January and to the Associate Provost by January 30, 2004. Reports were distributed across campus, for comments and feedback, in early February, 2004. Comments and feedback were due to the Associate Provost by mid-March and helped form the agenda for the Roundtable Discussions. Once complete, all information was reviewed and ratings were determined by the Provost.

Program definition

The Office of Academic Programming, using resources from Program and Catalog Maintenance and Course and Program Development, determined a tentative list of ISIS program codes in each department. The Office of Academic Programming contacted the scheduled department heads prior to the department workshops to verify the list of program codes. Guidelines were provided regarding the possible grouping of similar programs into a single report to prevent redundancy, as well as how to handle other extenuating situations, such as programs that were possibly already slated for phase out by the department. A memorandum was sent by the Associate Provost in October 2003 to verify the list of program codes and confirm how they would be reviewed.

Department workshops and preparation

The Office of Academic Programming met with department heads prior to the actual department workshop, to discuss program codes and general Program Review questions. After the initial department head contact, the workshops were conducted by Academic Programming staff, including Brian Hoxie, Director, Academic Programming and Donelle Goerlitz, Academic Programs Analyst. They were held in February and March 2003. Academic Programming staff visited each department separately, in order to present department specific materials and answer questions. This was much earlier than the previous two years' workshops, which were held the first year in late fall, the next year in late summer prior to their report due dates.

The workshops covered the broad nature of Program Review, explaining the history and general philosophy behind the process. The reporting format features were explained and suggestions were offered as to what type of data and information would be appropriate. The Program Review datasets, as well as other data, were discussed and explained, giving departments an opportunity to ask questions about the data. The Departmental Overview was also explained so that department heads were aware of their role in the process. The timeline was presented twice during the presentation to be sure that everyone was aware of their current status and get a sense of when their deadlines were. In addition, each department received a zip disk with their workshop on it, for future guidance.

Data analysis and distribution

The dataset for 2003-2004 Program Review was refined and organized manually, to avoid the errors that occurred during the 2002-2003 rotation. The data sets were provided in both printed and electronic (Excel) formats and delivered directly to department heads between 15 May 2003 and 30 June 2003.

It was decided that due to the implementation of the Banner system, in the midst of the academic year, the departments in the 2003-2004 rotation of Program Review would receive data from the

same timeframe as the 2002-2003 rotation. This included summer 1996 through spring 2002, providing them with six full years of data to work with.

Data files were requested from the Office of Records and Registration in winter 2003 for two reasons: one, to give the Office of Academic Programming more time for data refinement and organization; the other, due to the high level of involvement the Office of Records and Registration in the Banner conversion. The last files were received in February 2003. Academic Programming worked through the spring, 2003 term to refine and organize the raw data into structured, user-friendly Excel files, with a target delivery in May 2003.

The datasets, as distributed, included: accumulated GPA; awards (degrees) granted; hours to graduate; demographics, including age, ethnicity, gender, and residency; and full time versus part time status.

The Academic Programs Analyst met with each department head individually, to deliver each data set and answer questions. Steps were also taken at this time to begin developing a cooperative and collaborative relationship between the Office of Academic Programming and the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management, so they could prepare the Program Review datasets in the future.

Time

Time has been a continuous issue in the Program Review process. Moving up the timeline during the 2002-2003 rotation by a couple of months did not resolve the problem. The time allowed was still inadequate and departments again struggled to make their January deadlines. As a result, workshops for the 2003-2004 rotation were conducted winter 2003 and data distribution was done in spring 2003. This adjustment added approximately six months to the process. The adjustment allowed departments to begin work over the spring and summer analyzing data, and organizing and compiling their reports. The time adjustment currently allows for an additional six to seven months of Program Review report preparation.

Funding

Funding was not provided to departments during either the 2001-2002 or 2002-2003 rotations. However, it was apparent with the adjustment in time, that departments would need resources to begin the process earlier in the year.

The Provost set aside funding for departments for Program Review work performed during spring and summer 2003 terms. Funding was made available to the departments undergoing Program Review for the 2003-2004 rotation. It was not retroactive to the two prior years. The funds were distributed 1 May 2003 in the following manner:

- Each department received a base amount of \$1000.
- Each department then received an additional \$200 per program review report (*see the table below*).

2003-2004 Program Review Funding for Departments				
Department	# UG Program Codes	# GR Program Codes	Total # Program Codes	Total \$ (including the base \$1000/dept.)
Associated Health Professions	6	3	9	\$2,800

Biology	6	6	12	\$3,400
Business & Technology Education	9	3	12	\$3,400
Communications & Theatre Arts	3 (7)	4	7 (11)	\$3,200
English Language & Literature	11	5	16	\$4,200
Human, Environmental, and Consumer Resources	4	4	8	\$2,600
Leadership & Counseling	0	6	6	\$2,200
Marketing	6	0	6	\$2,200
Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminology (graduate only)	0	3	3	\$1,600
Total Disbursement			72 (83)	\$25,600

Analysis & report compilation

Once department workshops were completed, the program analysis process was handed off to the departments to begin work. The Office of Academic Programming followed up with data and assistance, with the Academic Programs Analyst working one on one with department heads and faculty to answer both data and general review related questions. The services of the Office of Academic Programming staff were offered for assistance throughout the report compilation period.

Departments were encouraged to set internal due dates, as well as to appoint a department coordinator for the effort. Reports were due to the college deans by 9 January 2004 and to the Associate Provost by 30 January 2004.

Campus feedback

In early February 2004, the Academic Programs Analyst, with help from a graduate assistant, duplicated and distributed Program Review reports to interested parties across campus for comments and feedback. Copies of reports were sent to Faculty Council, Graduate Council, the Graduate School, Continuing Education, and departments with significant interface. Comments were due to the Associate Provost by 19 March 2004 so they could be summarized and delivered to departments, along with an agenda for Roundtable Discussions, guided by the comments.

Roundtable Discussions

The Roundtable Discussions were 2-hour long, open meetings, to discuss each department's Program Review reports. They were scheduled by the Academic Programs Analyst during fall 2003 and took place between 31 March 2004 and 2 June 2004. The attendees included the Provost, the Associate Provost, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, college deans, department heads, faculty, program coordinators, and other interested parties. Faculty Council sent a representative to several meetings.

The Roundtable Discussions were intended to be an open forum where interested parties could discuss the Program Review reports, interpret the findings, and clarify the results. The meetings provided an opportunity for program coordinators, faculty, and department heads to respond to campus feedback and to interact directly with divisional leadership. A typical Roundtable Discussion included an overview from the department head and open, detailed dialogue regarding and guided by the campus feedback. The meetings concluded with comments from the department head, college dean, Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, Associate Provost, and Provost.

Certain themes emerged as Roundtable Discussions took place. Several programs raised issues concerning equipment and technology needs, interdisciplinary relationships, lecturer usage, marketing and recruiting, benchmarking, strategic planning, data support and Institutional Research. Roundtable Discussions have become the pinnacle of Program Review, culminating the long and rigorous process in a positive and collegial manner.

Provost's program assessments

The culmination of the 2003-2004 Program Review process was the ratings decisions issued by the Provost on 15 July 2004. The decisions were based on the review and analysis of the reports, outside comments, open discussions, and recommendations provided by the college deans and the Associate Provost. Decisions were distributed to college deans, with department heads provided a courtesy copy. The rating levels are described in Section I of this report.

V. 2003-2004 PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS

Provost's program assessments

The culmination of the 2003-2004 Program Review process was the ratings decisions that were issued by the Provost. The decisions were based on the review and analysis of the reports, outside comments, open discussions, and recommendations provided by the college deans and the Associate Provost. The rating levels are described in Section I of this report.

2003-2004 summary of program assessment ratings

The table below summarizes the results of the Provost's assessment ratings for the 2003-2004 rotation of Program Review. A "by program" listing of the ratings, including specific follow up actions and due dates, can be found in *Appendix F*. Section VII of the report will discuss the status of follow up actions in detail.

2003-2004 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATINGS	
<i>RATINGS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
(1) Continuation	30
(2) Continuation with specific changes	31
(3) Probation	3
(4) Phase Out	8
TOTALS	72

Detail in Appendix F.

VI. 2004-2005 PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

During 2003-2004 Program review, it was decided that for Program Review in the future, the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management would provide the datasets for Program Review. After several months of meetings, a template was developed and agreed upon. It was also decided that the datasets would be based on “official” reporting data, rather than “real time” data, as used in the past. Thus, the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management prepared and distributed the 2004-2005 Program Review datasets. They also attended and facilitated meetings with each department to give an overview of the dataset and help answer data related questions.

Adjustments made during previous rotations of Program Review in the areas of time, funding and data resulted in significant improvements in these areas for the 2004-2005 rotation as well. Additionally, the Academic Programming staff updated the Program Review Department Manual, along with the workshop presentations.

Process overview

Program Review 2004-2005 was initiated in fall, 2003 with establishment of an annual timeline (*Appendix G*). Next, the Office of Academic Programming determined a tentative list of ISIS and Banner program codes in each department. Scheduled departments were contacted in fall, 2003 by the Office of Academic Programming to schedule workshops to be held during the winter, 2004 term. Academic Programming conducted individual department workshops during January and February 2004.

With the decision made that the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management would be producing the datasets, a deadline for data distribution was set for 1 May 2004. Due to the complicated nature of data extraction and preparation, the deadline was not met, but data was delivered to departments on 11 June 2004. The Offices of Academic Programming and Institutional Research and Information Management then met together with each department to provide an overview of the dataset, make any needed corrections, and answer questions. These meetings were extremely productive and provided a first hand look at the idiosyncrasies of each department for the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management, further clarifying the complicated nature of the Program Review datasets.

Program definition

The Office of Academic Programming, using resources from Course and Catalog Maintenance and Course and Program Development, determined a tentative list of ISIS program codes in each department and then developed a Banner program code crosswalk. This was necessary since the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management planned to extract data from both ISIS and Banner. The Office of Academic Programming contacted the scheduled department heads prior to the department workshops to tentatively verify the list of program codes. Guidelines were provided to department heads regarding the possible grouping of similar

programs into a single report to prevent redundancy, as well as how to handle other extenuating situations, such as programs that were possibly already slated for phase out by the department.

Department workshops and preparation

The Office of Academic Programming met with department heads prior to the actual department workshop, to discuss program codes and general Program Review questions. After the initial department head contact, the workshops were conducted by Academic Programming staff, including Brian Hoxie, Director, Academic Programming and Donelle Goerlitz, Academic Programs Analyst. They were held in January and February 2004. Academic Programming staff visited each department separately, in order to present department specific materials and answer questions. As in the 2003-2004 rotation, the early presentation of workshops allowed departments to begin work on their reports nearly a year ahead of the required due date.

Workshops covered the broad nature of Program Review, explaining the history and general philosophy behind the process. The report features were explained and suggestions were offered as to what type of data and information would be appropriate. The Program Review datasets, as well as other data, were discussed and explained, giving departments an opportunity to ask questions about the data. The Departmental Overview was also explained so that department heads were aware of their role in the process. The timeline was presented twice during the presentation to be sure that everyone was aware of their current status and get a sense of when their deadlines were. In addition, each department received a CD with their workshop on it, for future guidance.

Data analysis and distribution

The 2004-2005 Program Review dataset was developed by the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management, subsequent to several months of meetings with the Office of Academic Programming to refine the dataset and template. The dataset included that from summer 1997 through spring 2003, with some data going back to 1995, which coincides with the inception of the ISIS database. Additionally, it was decided that the datasets would be based on “official” reporting data, meaning the bulk of it was drawn only from the fall term of each year mentioned above. The one exception was for the “awards” data, which was included for each full academic year.

The datasets were initially provided in electronic (Excel) format on a CD, and delivered directly to department heads on 11 June 2004. Due to printing challenges, several departments later received printed copies as well.

The datasets included were broken down into the following five sections: admissions; enrollments; awards; financial aid; and faculty productivity. Each section included specific data retrieved from various areas of admissions, ISIS, and the Banner databases. The admissions data was the least complete, encompassing only two years of data collected from internal admissions data files. There was also some question as to the validity of the admissions data, since it is manually maintained and is often purged. Financial aid data was also not accessible at this time. Nonetheless, the other three sections were complete and included the following data:

- Demographics, including: age; ethnicity; gender; and residency.
- Full time versus part time status.
- Accumulated GPA.
- Awards (degrees) granted.
- Hours to graduate.
- Faculty demographics.
- Faculty productivity.

- Grade distributions.

The Academic Programs Analyst, the Executive Director for Institutional Research and Information Management, and the Director for Institutional Research met with each department individually, to go through the datasets and answer questions.

Time

Time has been a continuous issue in the Program Review process. Workshops for the 2003-2004 rotation were conducted winter 2003 and data distribution was done in spring 2003. This adjustment added approximately six months to the process and seemed to be successful in resolving this issue. It was repeated in the 2004-2005 rotation of Program Review. The adjustment has allowed departments to work over the spring and summer to begin analyzing data, and organizing and compiling their reports, adding six to seven months to the timeline for Program Review report preparation.

Funding

Funding was not provided to departments during the 2001-2002 rotation or the 2002-2003 rotation. However, it was apparent with the adjustment in time, that departments would need resources to begin the process earlier in the year. In response, the Provost set aside funding for departments for Program Review work performed during spring and summer 2003 terms. Funding was made available to the departments undergoing Program Review for the 2003-2004 rotation and again during 2004-2005. It was not retroactive to the two prior years.

Due to a failure in communication, the 2004-2005 funds were distributed in mid-June 2004, yet several departments were not aware they had received their funding. The Office of Academic Programming worked closely with the affected departments and the Academic Affairs Manager of Budget and Operations to ensure departments were provided with their funding and that they were able to spend the money in the manner in which they intended. Since this funding will probably continue to be available, this is an area for improvement in coming years. In addition, since the Human, Environmental, and Consumer Resources department was rescheduled for 2004-2005 Program Review after funds were distributed in 2003-2004, their funds were transferred into the new fiscal year.

In keeping with the formula established during 2003-2004 Program Review, funding for 2004-2005 Program Review was distributed in the following manner:

- Each department received a base amount of \$1000.
- Each department then received an additional \$200 per program review report (*see the table below*).

2004-2005 Program Review Funding for Departments				
Department	# UG Program Codes	# GR Program Codes	Total # Program Codes	Total \$ (including the base \$1000/dept.)
African American Studies	1	1	2	\$1,400
Economics	5	5	10	\$3,000
HECR (<i>transferred from 2003-2004</i>)	4	4	8	\$2,600
History & Philosophy	6	5	11	\$3,200
Management	3	2	5	\$2,000
Music	6	2	8	\$2,600
Physics & Astronomy	8	3	11	\$3,200
Social Work	1	4	5	\$2,000
Special Education	6	9	15	\$4,000
Teacher Education	9	12	21	\$5,200
Women's Studies	1	1	2	\$1,400
<i>Total Disbursement</i>			<i>90</i>	<i>\$30,600</i>

Analysis & report compilation

Once department workshops were completed, the program analysis process was handed off to the departments to begin work. The Offices of Academic Programming and Institutional Research and Information Management followed up with data and assistance, working one on one with department heads and faculty to answer both data and general review related questions. The services of the Office of Academic Programming staff were offered for assistance throughout the report compilation period.

Departments are encouraged to set internal due dates, as well as to appoint a department coordinator for the effort. Reports are due to the college deans by 7 January 2005 and to the Associate Provost by 28 January 2005.

VII. FOLLOW UP IN PROGRESS ~ 2001-2002, 2002-2003, & 2003-2004

Per the Program Review Department Manual, pages 13-14, each Program Review report is assigned a rating by the Provost. Each rating includes specific follow-up activities and timelines, which are explained below. To date, there are follow up activities in progress from the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 Program Review rotations (*Appendix C & D*). Follow up activities for the 2003-2004 Program Review rotation (*Appendix F*) are currently in the early stages. Additionally, the Program Review Department Manual and department workshops are updated each year, to make appropriate adjustments and clarifications, in conjunction with the writing of the Annual Report.

Follow up guidelines

The Office of Academic Programming is responsible for monitoring follow up activities. Follow up guidelines are summarized in the “Assessment Ratings” table in Section I, page seven of this report. Specific details can be found on pages 13-14 of the Program Review Department Manual.

2001-2002 Follow up activities

Per the table on page seven of this report and the tables in Appendix D, twenty-three programs were rated (1) Continuation, and have no formal follow up actions required.

There were thirty programs rated (2) Continuation with specific changes. Deans are monitoring progress on approved Post-Review Improvement plans for these programs.

There were two programs rated (3) Probation. The Office of Academic Programming is responsible for monitoring these follow up activities. Currently, for ID08 – Independent Study Program for Public Safety program, the department has responded with plans to end date and phase out the program by 2005. Plans are being developed to halt admissions, shelve, and ultimately phase out PE04 – Recreation and Parks Management. Additionally, phase out plans for the two Centers and Institutes have been implemented and requests have been submitted to remove web page links to them.

2002-2003 Follow up activities

Per the table on page eight of this report, thirty-four programs were rated (1) Continuation, and have no formal follow up actions required.

There were twenty-two programs rated (2) Continuation with specific changes. Department heads and college deans have been monitoring progress on various Post-Review Improvement plans, and there appears to be good progress in key areas.

There were ten programs rated (3) Probation, primarily due to inter-college curricular conflicts. Departments have been working diligently on Post-Review Improvement Plans, which must be approved by the department head and college dean before implementation can begin. Post-Review Improvement Plans must include a timeline that does not exceed three years. The program must go through Program Review annually until the rating of (3) Probation is removed.

At this point, two of the ten programs – BU02, Bachelor of Language and World Business and BU18, Bachelor of International Business – have responded with a report regarding their future plans for the programs. The fate of the two programs has become a collective effort on the part of the international programs committee appointed in the College of Business and they appear to

be making good progress. It is clear the College of Business took Program Review seriously, and they are trying to address the shortcomings in these two programs.

It is not clear at this time how much progress has been made in the Department of Foreign Languages and Bilingual Studies on their business related programs. There are six programs included in the Probation rating – FL02, French for Business; FL04, German for Business; FL06, Spanish for Business; FL08, Language and International Trade; FL94, Graduate Certificate in German for Business; and FL97, Master of Language and International Trade. A report was submitted by the department in late May which outlined the steps taken thus far in the department. While some progress has been made, there is still much work to be completed. The department will have to aggressively pursue this project during fall 2004 in order to move to the next step, which is to develop a plan with a timeline and begin implementation. The college dean will need to work closely with the department head to move the programs forward quickly on the issues raised during Program Review. Nearly a year has passed already, with little progress being made. It will be difficult for the affected programs to make the needed changes before the full department undergoes Program Review for the second time, which could reflect negatively on those programs.

There were five programs rated (4) Phase Out, formalizing previous departmental decisions. The Office of Academic Programming will assist in the implementation of the Phase Out plans developed for the programs.

2003-2004 Follow up activities

Per the table on page thirteen of this report, thirty programs were rated (1) Continuation, and have no formal follow up actions required.

There were thirty-one programs rated (2) Continuation with specific changes. Departments are currently developing Post-Review Improvement plans to address the areas needing improvement identified during Program Review. Department heads and college deans will monitor progress on various Post-Review Improvement plans and provide an update to the Provost quarterly, in writing.

There were three programs rated (3) Probation. Two of the programs are an integral part of the reorganization of the College of Technology. Their Post-Review Improvement plans will hinge on the progress of the reorganization. It is a situation the college dean will need to monitor closely to ensure the required follow up takes place. The third program, from the Communication and Theatre Arts department, has been given a faculty line and new program coordinator. As with the other programs, the college dean will have to monitor the program closely to ensure the required follow up takes place. Each of these three programs will have to develop Post-Review Improvement Plans that include a timeline that does not exceed three years. The plans must be approved by the department head and college dean before implementation can begin. The Post-Review Improvement Plans for the programs in the College of Technology should describe how the transition plan addresses some of the issues raised in Program Review. Additionally, each of the programs must go through Program Review annually until the rating of (3) Probation is removed.

There were eight programs rated (4) Phase Out, most of which are merely formalizing previous departmental decisions. A couple of the programs in the former Business and Technology Education department are being phased out as part of the reorganization of the College of Technology. The college dean has already developed and received approval for his transition plan, which includes that for all resources. Formal Phase Out of the programs will depend on the progress of the reorganization and will need to be monitored closely as plans fall into place. The Office of Academic Programming will assist where needed in the implementation of the Phase Out plans developed for the programs.

Program Review Department Manual

Changes to the manual were made to capture the adjustments made to the process over the year, and to clarify some aspects of the process. These changes include adjustments regarding the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management's new role in dataset preparation and distribution; updates to the schedule for the second cycle; redirection of reporting from the Associate Provost's position to the Office of the Provost; and updates regarding funding now provided to departments to support the Program Review process.

VIII. OUTLOOK

The Office of the Provost is dedicated to providing each department undergoing Program Review, with complete, accurate, and timely data. One of the main goals for the 2004-2005 rotation is to refine the datasets provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management. Additionally, the concept of interdisciplinary relationships will also be an area of focus. With a large number of interdisciplinary programs on the schedule this year, how programs encompass coursework and faculty from different departments, and sometimes different colleges, can maximize their resources and increase efficient program delivery will be an area of interest. It will also be a goal of Academic Programming to begin to streamline and systematize the benchmarking process for departments. This has been an area of weakness in the past that can be dramatically improved with guidance.

The whole notion of curriculum maintenance, or the "housekeeping" tasks, associated with academic program delivery is one that should be second nature to departments and program coordinators. The staff of Academic Programming is committed to helping departments and programs integrate the various functions associated with academic program maintenance and delivery into their daily operations. As a result of Program Review, departments that participated during 2001-2002, 2002-2003, and 2003-2004 now have a solid foundation for the current cycle of strategic planning. Program Review has provided the opportunity to perform an in depth analysis of their programs, an overview of their departments, and a close look at their students and alumni. Supported by data, departments and programs should now have a deeper understanding of their programs and the students they serve. They also have identified the various strengths and weaknesses, to provide a focus for continuous improvement planning. This is useful information as departments and programs move forward with the current round of strategic planning, as well as outside accreditation preparations in the future.

As program review commences each year, the collaborative efforts of the staff in Academic Programming are instrumental to the success of the process. It is through the hard work of Brian Hoxie, Director, Academic Programming, Joy Dockham, Manager, Program and Catalog

Maintenance, Bill Miller, Director, Course and Program Development, and Donelle Goerlitz, Academic Programs Analyst, that Program Review is successful. Each rotation of Program Review entails extensive updating and enhancement, in order to continually improve the process. As Program Review becomes institutionalized, it will be more complex, due to the many overlapping follow up activities. It is critical that this follow up is monitored and enforced to ensure full and complete compliance, which will result in the improvement of our academic programs and the vitality of the curriculum.

The Program Review process has demonstrated its value as a tool for assessing program quality, effectiveness, efficiency, and benefit. The process assures that our academic programs are meeting student and regional needs and provides a means for students to maximize their potential for success. It institutes and reinforces a campus culture of continuous improvement, and efficient and effective use of resources, while providing faculty and administration a formal means to evaluate programs and integrate continuous improvement strategies.

Appendix A
Academic Program Review Schedule
2001-2009

Appendix B
Program Review Timeline

Appendix C
2001-2002
Provost Ratings Decisions by
Department and Program Code

Appendix D
2002-2003
Provost Ratings Decisions by
Department and Program Code

Appendix E
2003-2004
Program Review Timeline

Appendix F
2003-2004
Provost Ratings Decisions by
Department and Program Code

Appendix G
2004-2005
Program Review Timeline